



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,510	12/26/2000	Fredrick L. Pittroff	018280-000700US	4105
20350	7590	05/03/2006	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			ALPERT, JAMES M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/748,510

Applicant(s)

PITTROFF, FREDRICK L.

Examiner

James Alpert

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/2/2005 & 2/16/2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11, 13-14, 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11, 13 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The following communication is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 11/02/2005, as well as Applicant's election, filed 02/16/2006.

Status of Claims

Applicant's election without traverse of Group 2, Claims 11, 13-14, and 16 in the reply filed on 02/16/2006, is acknowledged. Claims 1-10, 12, 15 are therefore cancelled. Claims 11, 13-14, 16 are previously presented.

The examiner is also canceling Claim 16. In the restriction requirement, Claim 16 was included with Group 2 due to a typographical error. The claim is dependent on Claim 1, however, so it cannot be included in Group 2. Pursuant to telephonic communication with Applicant's representative, Darren Gibby, Registration #38464, it is agreed that Claim 16 is canceled as well. Therefore, Claims 11 and 13-14 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant has argued that the claims teach unique queuing features that distinguish the claims over the prior art, as cited in the non-final Office action mailed 05/20/2005. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are moot in view of the rejections formulated as a result of Applicant's amendments to the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of Title 35, U.S. Code §103 can be found in the prior Office action. Claims 11 & 13 are rejected under §103 as being unpatentable over Jaros et al, U.S. Patent #6877656 in view of Warwick et al, U.S. Patent #5266781. Claim 14 is rejected

Art Unit: 3624

as being unpatentable over Jaros in view of Warwick, and further in view of Chari et al, U.S. Patent #6134614.

With regard to Claim 11, Jaros teaches the method comprising:

generating a request in a client process to produce an identification card wherein said request includes information regarding a type of card to be produced;
(Col. 9, lines 25-39, describing the request by the user for a card, secured or otherwise, and Figure #2, items 206,202, which accepts requests and can transmits information a central server)

transmitting said request from said client process to an enterprise server process through an enterprise network to manage the production of said identification card; and
(Figure #1, item 102, which is the central decisioning system, which manages production of ID card. Figure #2, items 206,202 transmit request to the decisioning system)

With regard to the following limitation:

evaluating a rule set and placing the request into either a card issuance component queue where cards are ready for immediate production or into a production queue for later production based on the evaluation;

it would seem that Jaros would necessarily employ some sort of queuing system, given the discussion beginning on (Col. 5, line 54) which describes the situation wherein certain cards are not produced immediately, and are withheld for production at the central location. Still, Jaros does not expressly disclose a queuing method. However, in an analogous case, Warwick does disclose a production control system that utilizes a "pending queue" for later production, and a "cards in progress" queue for those cards being immediately issued. This system is described at (Warwick, Figure #26 and Col. 24, line 53 – Col. 26, line 8). The system would base the decision as to queuing on the type and number of cards needed at an individual remote location, as described in Jaros. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

Art Unit: 3624

applicant's invention was made to modify the teachings of Jaros to include a queuing system for managing card production. The motivation for such a combination would be within the general knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and would simply be to enhance customer satisfaction by timely distributing cards and preventing errors by proper queuing.

Once, a card is placed in an issue queue, Jaros teaches the remaining limitation:

forwarding said request from said card issuance component queue to a card issuance controller process coupled to a plurality of card issuance components for production of the identification card. (Col. 5, line 64 – Col. 6, line 4)

With regard to Claim 13, Jaros teaches the method further comprising:

linking said request to a particular card issuance component queue or production queue based at least in part on the requested card type and a location where the request originated. (Col. 5, line 64 – Col. 6, line 4)

The cited passage demonstrates that Jaros will route queue request to various remote card dispensers based on location and on collaboration. Given that a queue system is used at the remote locations in a Jaros/Warwick combination, the result is that the request will be forwarded to component queue that is available and located near the origin of the request.

With regard to Claim 14, Jaros does not expressly teach the method further comprising:

receiving instruction from an administrative user to process requests in said production queue; and transferring said request from said production queue to said card issuance component queue.

However, Warwick teaches the queuing limitations at (Warwick, Col. 25, lines 23-35), which details the mechanics of moving requests from one queue to another. While

neither Jaros nor Warwick expressly teaches receiving instructions from an administrative user, this feature old and well known, and is demonstrated in Cheri at (Col. 6, lines 16-27 and Col. 8 lines 15-18). Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to modify the teachings of Jaros/Warwick to include the ability to move requests from one queue to the other, at the request of an administrative user. The motivation for such a combination within the general knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and would simply be to enhance customer satisfaction by preventing errors by ensuring proper queuing, and by increasing flexibility and reliability by allowing a central administrative user more direct control of the process.

In summary, each of Applicant's limitations in the claims are known in the art and there is proper motivation to combine the reference to preclude applicant's invention as claimed.

Conclusion


Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension

fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Alpert whose telephone number is (571) 272-6738. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (571) 272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197.

James M. Alpert
May 1, 2006



JAGDISH N. PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER